



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,406	10/17/2003	Keith A. Thuerk	BOC9-2003-0034 (403)	1299
40987	7590	02/03/2009		
AKERMAN SENTERFITT P. O. BOX 3188 WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188			EXAMINER ULRICH, NICHOLAS S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2173	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/03/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 and 4-10 are pending.
2. Claim 1 is amended.
3. Claims 2, 3, and 11-26 are cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Perry et al. (US 7020696 B1).

In regard to claim 1, Perry discloses a method for presenting system services comprising the steps of:

categorizing said system services into functional groups based on functions of the system services (*Column 21 lines 59-61 and column 21 line 54-Column 22 line 56*);

establishing a plurality of system service profiles, each system service profile representing a customized subset of the system services (*Column 47 lines 27-44 and Column 45 lines 17-60*);

detecting a request for the presentation of system services from a user (*Column 50 lines 39-47*);

ascertaining an identity of the user and at least one computing device associated with the request (*Column 50 lines 39-47*);

determining a privilege group associated with the user (*Column 48 lines 24-32*);

determining at least one of said system service profiles corresponding to the user, the privilege group, and/or the at least one computing device (*Column 50 lines 39-47*);

determining at least one system service to be displayed in accordance with the at least one determined system service profile (*Column 47 lines 25-50 and Column 49 lines 14-19*);

and displaying the determined at least one system service within a graphical user interface in an order based on the categorization (*Column 21 lines 59-61 and column 21 line 54-Column 22 line 56*).

In regard to claims 4 and 5, Perry discloses further comprising the steps of

categorizing said system services by computing device (*Column 19 lines 25-29*);

In regard to claim 6, Perry discloses said establishing step further comprising the step of:

providing a system services configuration interface so that authorized users can modify at least one system service profile (*Column 48 lines 9-11*).

In regard to claim 7, Perry discloses said providing step further comprising the steps of:

providing a series of views to perform a task relating to at least one system service profile in a step-wise fashion, whereby said series of views represent a system service profile configuration wizard (*Column 48 lines 9-19*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perry et al. (US 7020696 B1) in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary (Microsoft Press, 2002).

In regard to claim 10, while Perry teaches providing service profiles and listing the services associated with those profiles, Perry fails to disclose integrating the service profiles with a directory service of an operating system including a Microsoft Active Directory.

However, the Microsoft Computer Dictionary teaches an active directory that is designed to enable applications to find, use, and manage directory resources including user names and permissions (*Microsoft Computer Dictionary pg 16*). It would have

been obvious at the time of invention to those skilled in the art, to incorporate the teachings of Microsoft Computer Dictionary and integrate service profiles within an active directory. The motivation would be to simplify directory-related activities associated with locating and administering network users and resources as taught by Microsoft Computer Dictionary (*pg 16*).

6. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perry et al. (US 7020696 B1) with reference to Background section of present invention.

In regard to claim 8, Perry fails to disclose the system services are Microsoft system services that execute within a Microsoft Windows type operating system.

However, the background section of the present invention discloses Microsoft system services. Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to include system services which are Microsoft system services. The motivation would be to manage system services as disclosed by the background section of the present invention.

In regard to claim 9, Perry fails to disclose presenting system services within a graphical user interface included within the Microsoft Configuration Utility.

However, the background section of the present invention discloses the Microsoft Configuration Utility, which is used for managing system services. Therefore it would

have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to present system services within the Microsoft Configuration Utility. The motivation would be to manage system services as disclosed by the background section of the present invention.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 9/03/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Perry does not disclose that the different resources should be categorized into functional groups and displayed based on the categorization, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to better define the limitation “categorizing said system services into functional groups”. Applicant’s amendment has limited the functional groups to include “functional groups based on functions of the system services”. Upon further review of the cited reference, Perry (US 7020696), the examiner has located a teaching that describes functional groups based on functions of the system services. Perry teaches two steps of categorization of system services. First, the system services are categorized according to the servers that provide the system services. This allows a user to select a particular server, and manage the services provided by the particular server. The second step of categorization taught by Perry is breaking down each network device into groups of services based on their functions. When a network device is selected, a series of tabs are displayed to the user. Each tab corresponds to a particular function of the network device. Perry

discusses a system tab, Module Tab, Ports tab, and SONET interface tab. Each tab can be accessed in order to allow an administrator to view and modify the data. See Perry, Column 21 line 54 through Column 23 line 26, for explanation of the displayed tabs.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NICHOLAS S. ULRICH whose telephone number is (571)270-1397. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 9:00 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kieu Vu can be reached on (571)272-4057. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number:
10/688,406
Art Unit: 2173

Page 8

/Tadesse Hailu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2173

Nicholas Ulrich
1/29/2009
2173